

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 were pending in the application. Claims 4, 6, 8, 12 and 13 are being cancelled.

Claims 7, 9, 23 and 24 are being amended. Amendments to claims 7 and 9 are based on the language of the table on pages 10 and 11 of the PCT application as originally filed.

Amendments to claims 14, 23 and 24 are based on language on page 14, line 15 and page 16, lines 8-18 of the specification as originally filed.

***Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119***

Applicants note that the Examiner acknowledged a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 to Polish Patent Application No. P-355743 filed August 28, 2002 and confirmed that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau.

All outstanding requirements will now be addressed in the order they appear in the Office Action mailed February 9, 2007.

***Objection***

***Abstract***

**1.** The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet. Applicants submit herewith an amended abstract and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

*Specification*

**2-3.** The Fig. 6 of the drawing is alleged not to be descriptive. In addition, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that, the terms “keep-units”, “skip-units”, node-specific” and “decapsulating”, in claims 7, 9, 14 and 14, respectively, cannot be found in the specification. Furthermore, the limitation in lines 16 to 16 in claim 24 is not defined in the specification. Applicants have amended the respective claims and have used non-hyphenated terms in the specification and in the claims to obviate the Examiner’s objection.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

**4-5.** Claim 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. The Office Action asserts out that claim 23 recites the limitation “nodes” without sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in this claim. Applicants have amended claim 23 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection with respect to the claims as amended.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner considers the claimed subject matter of claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 15-22 to be patentable over the prior art and considers the claimed subject matter of claims 7, 9, 24-26 and 22 to be patentable over the prior art and allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection to the specification and the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, respectively, set forth in this Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims have been rewritten to overcome the Examiner's objections and rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

***CONCLUSION***

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 503182**.

Customer Number: **33,794**

Respectfully Submitted,

/Matthias Scholl/  
Dr. Matthias Scholl, Esq.  
Reg. No. 54,947  
Attorney of Record

Date: May 07, 2007